

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated June 17, 2005, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 and 4-13 are allowed over the prior art. The Examiner further rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by *Childs* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,680,638). Applicant has amended claim 14. For the reasons given below, Applicant respectfully submits that *Childs* does not disclose, teach, or even suggest the presently claimed invention.

Amended claim 14 recites that when the width of an identified scratch defect is greater than 6 pixels at normal broadcast resolution or 10 pixels at high definition, the following steps are carried out. Firstly, at least one column of pixels from within the scratch defect is removed, and image pixels from outside the scratch defect are moved in to compensate for the removed pixels. Then, the remaining pixels within the scratch defect are corrected by using values interpolated from pixels on either side of the scratch. The reason for employing this method, as discussed on page 13 of the specification, is that for scratches having a width greater than that defined above, interpolation across the scratch would produce a notable defect, *i.e.*, the image quality of the corrected image would be substandard. To overcome this problem, the invention of claim 14 provides the two-stage method discussed above.

The Examiner submits that *Childs* discloses removing at least one column of pixels from within the scratch defect and moving image pixels outside the scratch defect in to compensate for the removed pixels at column 3, lines 43-49. This does disclose one possible embodiment in which the information to correct for a scratch defect is taken from earlier or later parts of the current line of the picture in which the defect occurs. However, in this embodiment *all* of the information required to correct for the scratch

defect would be taken from this one source. There is absolutely no disclosure of combining this method with an interpolation where the scratch is determined to have a width greater than 6 or 10 pixels, depending on the definition of the image.

The Examiner further submits that in column 6, lines 1-12 of *Childs* discloses correcting the scratch defect with values interpolated from either side thereof. Again, there is no suggestion that this method could be combined with that of replacing some of the pixels with image pixels moved in from outside the scratch defect as disclosed by the method of claim 14.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn. Applicant hereby earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the basis of this amendment and feels that a telephone conference would help clear up any unresolved matters, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP


Anthoula Pomrening
Reg. No. 38,805

Dated: August 17, 2005

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone No. 312-913-0001
Facsimile No. 312-913-0002